UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Friday, 19 November 1993
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND PART* OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS (continued)

* The summary record of the first part of the meeting, held on Friday, 19 November 1993, at 10 a.m., appears as document A/C.1/48/SR.30.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.30/Add.1
28 January 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

93-82600 (E)

The meeting was resumed at 3.10 p.m.

ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued) (A/C.1/48/L.11, L.24, L.32, L.34/Rev.1, L.49/Rev.1, A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2, A/C.1/48/L.56, A/C.1/48/L.24 and A/C.1/48/L.32)

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11

1. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that following informal consultations the sponsors of the draft resolution had decided not to press for a vote on it at present and were consequently withdrawing it.

2. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11 was withdrawn.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.24 and L.32

3. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) said that in the past few weeks the Committee had tried to reorganize its work so as to rationalize it. The result had been draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.51, submitted under agenda item 156. Now, after the historic submission of the draft resolution on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests, the Committee had to decide on two draft resolutions, A/C.1/48/L.24 and L.32, both dealing with international security but inspired by philosophies which could not be regarded as identical. It would be recalled that during the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, the General Assembly had adopted a declaration on the subject (General Assembly resolution 2627 (XXV), and it would be appropriate on the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations in 1995 to adopt another resolution expressing the almost unanimous view of the members of the Organization on the path to be followed with respect to international security. In his view, consequently, what was at issue was not simply the question of rationalization but an effort to obtain a consensus on the question. He therefore proposed that no decision should be taken on the two draft resolutions and that the question should simply be included in the agenda of the forty-ninth session in the hope that in the meantime a harmonization of positions would take place which could only benefit the work of the Organization.

4. Mr. LEDOGER (United States of America) said that he would insist on a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24.

5. Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia) supported the Mexican representative's proposal and regretted that it could not be adopted in view of the position taken by the United States representative.

6. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) said that he had not asked that a vote should not be taken but only that the Committee should refrain from taking an immediate decision in the hope that, in coming years, common ground could be found.

7. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America) withdrew his request.

8. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a request for suspension of the meeting by Mr. SHOUKRY (Egypt), said that he could not suspend the meeting at the present stage and proposed that the Committee should simply decide not to take any decision on the two draft resolutions for the time being in order to give their sponsors time to consult further.

9. It was so decided.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.34 and Rev.1 and L.49/Rev.1

10. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) read out a draft amendment (A/C.1/48/L.49/Rev.1) to the amendment previously submitted (A/C.1/48/L.49) concerning the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34.

11. Mr. FLORENT (France), speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Slovakia and the United States of America, said that should amendment A/C.1/48/L.49/Rev.1 be adopted those countries would find it necessary to withdraw their sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34/Rev.1. They would do so regretfully, as they all attached great importance to strengthening the provisions of the Convention of 10 October 1980 and its Protocols, particularly Protocol II on Mines and Booby Traps and to increasing the number of States parties to those instruments. In their view, the proposed amendment would not serve that purpose. However, in view of their interest in the matter, those States would nevertheless continue to give active support to the action undertaken and would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34/Rev.1 submitted by Sweden.

12. A recorded vote was taken on draft amendment A/C.1/48/L.49/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Singapore, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine.

13. The draft amendment (A/C.1/48/L.49/Rev.1) was adopted by 52 votes to 24, with 32 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34/Rev.1

Explanation of vote before the vote

14. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America) said it was a sad day for the First Committee when one delegation insisted on language which was inconsistent with an existing multilateral treaty and thus knowingly ensured that there would be no consensus on a resolution dealing with that treaty. Leaving aside the substantive question of whether parties to the Convention did nor did not wish to pursue the objectives proposed in the Mexican amendment - a question which was for the parties to decide in the appropriate forum - the United States found it unacceptable to use the Committee for influencing the purpose and provisions of an existing international treaty. That development was highly regrettable and the United States hoped it would not become standard practice in the Committee. It hoped also that delegations would recognize how the resolution contained in document A/C.1/48/L.34 had been abused by the amendment submitted by the Mexican delegation and would not support it. The United States was withdrawing its sponsorship of that draft resolution.

Fifth preambular paragraph

15. A separate recorded vote was taken on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34/Rev.1 as amended by amendment L.49/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Czech Republic, Estonia, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

16. The fifth preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 57 votes to 4, with 55 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34/Rev.1 as a whole

Explanations of vote before the vote

17. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) said he regretted that the amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution had been adopted, as it changed the nature of the draft resolution by introducing a question of substance into what had before been only a procedural matter. His delegation would therefore be unable to vote for the draft resolution.

18. Mr. VASILYEV (Belarus), Mr. WHANNOU (Benin) and Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine) said that in view of the adoption of the amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution they were withdrawing from its sponsorship.

19. Mr. NORBERG (Sweden), Mr. COLLINS (Ireland), Mr. OJANEN (Finland) and Ms. MASON (Canada) said they would have preferred the draft resolution in its original form, as the amendment unbalanced the text. The Swedish delegation had abstained in the vote on that amendment but continued to attach great importance to the question and would therefore continue to sponsor the draft resolution.

20. Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands) associated himself with the statement by the Swedish representative. He had also abstained in the separate vote on the amendment to the draft resolution because he found the paragraph in question inappropriate but remained a sponsor of the draft resolution and regretted that other States had withdrawn their sponsorship.

21. Mr. GUILLAUME (Belgium) and Mr. WOLZFELD (Luxembourg) said they had voted against the amendment and were also withdrawing from sponsorship of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. SIAM (Lebanon) pointed out that the Arab text of the draft amendment contained an error. Reference was made to the eighth preambular paragraph of the Convention but what was meant was the ninth preambular paragraph.

23. The CHAIRMAN assured the Lebanese representative that the Secretariat would correct the error.

24. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) read out the statement of the Secretary-General on the financial implications of the draft resolution in which he referred to his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34/Rev.1 to establish a group of governmental experts to prepare the Review Conference on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects for the purpose of reviewing the operation of the Convention and amend its Protocols, and to furnish needed assistance and assure services, including the preparation of analytical reports which the review conference and the group of experts might need. In the past, conferences of that type on multilateral disarmament treaties had included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference, including the sessions of the Preparatory Committee. Under those arrangements, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization. Accordingly, the Secretary-General considered that his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34/Rev.1, namely to provide needed assistance and services for the preparation and holding of the Review Conference, had no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the Review Conference of the Convention. Furthermore, activities related to international conventions or treaties to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations might only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities had been received from the States parties in advance.

25. He then announced the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34/Rev.1 entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects": Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Finland, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

26. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34/Rev.1 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan,

Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Russian Federation, United States of America.

27. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 140 to none, with 2 abstentions.

28. Mr. PELAEZ (Argentina), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained from the vote on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/48/L.49/Rev.1 and from the separate vote on the fifth preambular paragraph, but had voted for the draft resolution as a whole. Argentina welcomed the initiation of a review of the Convention, but, in that regard, considered that the review of all aspects related to such weapons should take place in the context of the Review Conference.

29. Ms. LONDONO (Colombia) said that if her delegation had been present during the vote, it would have voted in favour of the amendment proposed by Mexico and the fifth preambular paragraph, just as it had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

30. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Colombia that her statement would be duly recorded in the summary record of the meeting.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2 and proposed amendments A/C.1/48/L.56

31. Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands) said that the initiative of Afghanistan was important and that he welcomed the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2. Unfortunately, however, the consultations held with a view to merging that draft with draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27 introduced by Colombia had not succeeded and he expressed the hope that they would be resumed before the General Assembly considered those resolutions in plenary session. As to the proposed amendments (A/C.1/48/L.56) to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2 introduced by Cuba, the second amendment was unacceptable

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

because it was not clearly formulated and the request made of the Secretary-General was ambiguous.

32. Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) recalled that his delegation had been in favour of merging the draft resolutions introduced by Afghanistan (A/C.1/48/L.31) and Colombia (A/C.1/48/L.27), and had proposed several amendments to Afghanistan's proposal. If the Committee took a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2, it would first, under the rules of procedure, have to decide on the amendments proposed by Cuba. With reference to the wording of the second amendment, it should be made clear that the countries in question were those which requested the collection of illegally distributed weapons. He emphasized that collection was a national responsibility of sovereign countries and that the request, for that reason, could not be made collectively. The aim of his delegation's first amendment was to avoid a specific mention of developing countries, since the problem also arose in developed countries.

33. The CHAIRMAN noted that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2 was inaccurately quoted in document A/C.1/48/L.56. He requested the representative of Cuba to submit a revised version of the text he wished to have considered, in Spanish and, if possible, in English, so that the Committee might take a fully informed decision.

34. The meeting was suspended at 4.10 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.24 and A/C.1/48/L.32

35. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should consider draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.24 and A/C.1/48/L.32, and indicated that the representative of Mexico had proposed that no decision should be taken on the two draft resolutions, but that consultations should continue.

36. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) said that after discussing the Mexican proposal during the suspension of the meeting, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32 had decided that it was conducive to rationalization of the First Committee's work, because international security was one of the subjects included in draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.51. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32 were, therefore, prepared to accept the Mexican proposal if the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24 did likewise.

37. Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia) said that, after consultations, the representatives of the non-aligned countries had decided to ask the Committee to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that if the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24 wanted the Committee to take a decision on that draft, the Committee would also have to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32.

39. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) said that in view of the statement of the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the group of non-aligned countries, his delegation withdrew its proposal.

40. Mr. FOUATHIA (Algeria) said that the non-aligned countries appreciated the efforts of the representative of Mexico but that his proposal had come too late for in-depth consideration. The proposal should be borne in mind at the next session.

41. Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) noted that the text of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32 was contradictory in certain respects. While the preambular part of the draft resolution recalled resolution 47/54 G in which the General Assembly decided that the First Committee, in pursuit of its efforts to respond to the new realities of international security, should continue to deal with questions of disarmament and related international security issues, the operative part addressed questions which could only loosely be called "related international security issues". Moreover, most of the questions addressed in the draft resolution had already been considered in the context of discussions of the report of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace" and had been the subject of a General Assembly resolution, namely, resolution 47/120 B of 20 September 1993, which had been adopted by consensus. It was therefore inappropriate to go over ground already covered by submitting a draft resolution concerning questions about which agreement had already been reached.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.24 and A/C.1/48/L.32. He invited delegations wishing to do so to speak in explanation of vote.

43. Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24, said that he regretted that Mexico's suggestion had not been acted upon and that the Committee was preparing to adopt two draft resolutions on international security. The First Committee should strive to encourage initiatives taken under "An Agenda for Peace". At the forty-ninth session, over-broad debate should be avoided by focusing on the broad areas indicated in draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.51.

44. Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32, said that he still did not understand its content. Since General Assembly resolution 47/120 B had been adopted by consensus, he did not understand why the sponsors had made reference to "An Agenda for Peace" and "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold war era". Moreover, the lack of specificity regarding the effective measures advocated in operative paragraph 2 could give rise to varying interpretations. Regional organizations should indeed coordinate their activities with the United Nations; however, decisions on those questions should be left to the organizations concerned. Finally, operative paragraph 7 did not mention nuclear disarmament. That question should have been given priority.

45. Mr. FOUATHIA (Algeria) said it was unfortunate that the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.32 and A/C.1/48/L.24 had not taken a concerted approach since the texts related to the same subject. In addition, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32 had taken no account at all of two very important declarations which the General Assembly had adopted on the occasion of the Organization's twenty-fifth anniversary, namely, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States

(Mr. Fouathia, Algeria)

in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Furthermore, while the draft reaffirmed the need for the United Nations to take on new tasks and to prevent and remove threats to peace, it nowhere reminded States of their duty to respect the principles of the Charter in their international relations.

46. No one would dispute that the change in international relations called for a new and pragmatic approach to security problems within the United Nations. That approach should be based on a unified conception of the parameters to be considered, which encompassed both principles governing inter-State relations and principles relating to human life, and on a proper balance between the two principal organs of the Organization. Since draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32 did not meet those two requirements adequately, his delegation would abstain during the vote. It hoped that at the forty-ninth session, the question of the maintenance of international security could be treated in an integrated comprehensive manner and addressed in a single draft resolution.

47. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom) said that he would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24. However, he joined with the representative of the Netherlands in hoping that the subject of the draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.24 and A/C.1/48/L.32 would receive appropriate consideration during the Committee's 1994 session. In that regard, he noted that some of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.32, including the United Kingdom, had suggested to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24 consultations with a view to merging the two texts; however, that offer had not been accepted. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom hoped that, as a result of the initiative of Mexico, the effort to merge the two texts would be successful during the forty-ninth session.

48. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) welcomed the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32 recognized the important contribution the General Assembly could make to efforts to maintain international security. He believed, however, that the text focused excessively on the role of the Security Council, at the expense of that of the General Assembly, with regard to the maintenance of peace and international security. For that reason, Ghana would abstain during the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32.

49. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius,

Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

50. The draft resolution was adopted by 100 votes to 1, with 41 abstentions.

51. Mr. LAVINA (Philippines) endorsed the reservations expressed by Indonesia with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32 and said that he would abstain during the vote on the draft.

52. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) and Mr. El TINOY (Sudan) endorsed the views of the representatives of Cuba, Ghana, Indonesia and Algeria on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32 and said that they would abstain during the vote.

53. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32.

In favour: Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

54. The draft resolution was adopted by 67 votes to none, with 75 abstentions.

55. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/489/L.32 because its positive elements outweighed its shortcomings. Two aspects of the draft resolution were especially commendable. First, it emphasized preventive diplomacy and the need to develop appropriate political mechanisms for the early solution of disputes, which had long been a concern for Pakistan. In a period during which the number of conflicts was increasing, it was essential to develop mechanisms which would allow the resolution of disputes before they escalated into full-blown conflicts. Second, the call for full implementation of Security Council resolutions deserved to be heeded by the international community. Like many other States, Pakistan believed that the Security Council's decision-making process needed to be made more transparent and democratic. However, that did not mean that until the Security Council was reformed, its decisions should be ignored. Indeed, it was essential for the effective functioning of the United Nations that decisions of the Security Council should be implemented fully and in their entirety. Otherwise, not only would the United Nations lose its credibility as an institution, but the rules which it sought to uphold would be undermined. That was vividly illustrated by the non-implementation of many Security Council resolutions.

56. While it appreciated the positive elements of the draft resolution, his delegation was not oblivious to its weaknesses. A major shortcoming was the lack of any mention of the crucial role of the General Assembly in the maintenance of international peace and security. His delegation hoped that that omission would be corrected and that the resolution adopted in 1994 on the subject would reflect a correct balance between the role of the General Assembly and that of the Security Council in the maintenance of peace and security.

57. Mrs. SRISWAS (Thailand) said that if her delegation had been present when the Committee voted on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24, it would have voted in favour of it.

58. Mr. RANGEL (Venezuela) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32 although it was not opposed to the substance of the draft resolution and believed that it had some positive aspects. However, his delegation felt that the draft resolution submitted on behalf of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement corresponded more closely to the interests of developing countries. Moreover, Venezuela would have preferred it if a single text had been negotiated which could have been adopted by consensus, so as to encourage cooperation in the sphere of disarmament and international security. It was to be hoped that in 1994 the Committee would be able to adopt a consensus resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2 and the amendments proposed in document A/C.1/48/L.56

59. Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) said that he had held consultations with delegations which shared the concerns of his delegation and wished to propose that, at the end of the second Cuban amendment (A/C.1/48/L.56, para. 2), the words "countries which so request" should be replaced by "countries, in the event that such countries so request,".

60. Mr. MEHR (Afghanistan) said that he could not accept the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2 proposed by Cuba; he requested that the two amendments be voted on separately and that a recorded vote be taken.

61. Mr. PERRI (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that he would vote in favour of the amendments proposed by Cuba because they improved the text and removed the somewhat discriminatory aspect of the original text. He would not vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2 since he believed that in some respects it duplicated draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1, which had already been adopted by the Committee. He believed that his delegation's position accorded with the objective of modernizing the Committee's methods of work. Brazil would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

62. At the request of the representative of Afghanistan, a recorded vote was taken on the first amendment proposed by Cuba in document A/C.1/48/L.56.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman,

Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

63. The first amendment proposed by Cuba was adopted by 105 votes to 1, with 34 abstentions.

64. At the request of the representative of Afghanistan, a recorded vote was taken on the second amendment, as orally revised, proposed by Cuba in document A/C.1/48/L.56.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

65. The second amendment proposed by Cuba, as orally revised, was adopted by 100 votes to 1, with 40 abstentions.

66. At the request of the representative of Afghanistan, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2, as amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Ghana, Guyana, Jamaica, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Panama, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

67. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.2, as amended, was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 33 abstentions.

68. Mrs. MASON (Canada) said that she had abstained in the vote on the amendments and on the draft resolution for the reasons explained by the representative of Brazil before the vote.

69. Mr. PONCE (Ecuador) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendments and had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution for the same reasons as Brazil.

70. Mr. RANGEL (Venezuela) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the amendments and on the draft resolution because it had difficulty in understanding the purpose of the draft resolution. Moreover, the draft resolution contained a number of ideas that were difficult to accept.

71. Mrs. LAOSE-AIAYI (Nigeria) said that if her delegation had been present it would have voted in favour of all the draft resolutions and amendments adopted so far by the Committee, with the exception of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32, on which it would have abstained.

72. Mr. DORANI (Djibouti) said that his delegation had been unable to attend several meetings of the Committee and that if it had been present it would have voted in favour of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/48/L.3, A/C.1/48/L.5/Rev.1 (including paras. 8, 10 and 18), A/C.1/48/L.9, A/C.1/48/L.10, A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2, A/C.1/48/L.15, A/C.1/48/L.22, A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1, A/C.1/48/L.30, A/C.1/48/L.36, A/C.1/48/L.37, A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, A/C.1/48/L.39 and A/C.1/48/L.48.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.